The Christian Approach to Social Morality—Richard C. Cabot

VICTORIA UNIVERSITY
3 1761 06305117 1

HQ
C112c

HQ
C112c

This book belongs to

THE LIBRARY

of

VICTORIA UNIVERSITY

Toronto 5, Canada

ADDISON

Mrs. E. J. C.

Margaret E. T. Addison
Amesbury Hall

The Christian Approach to Social Morality

THREE LECTURES BY

RICHARD C. CABOT, M. D.

ON

THE CONSECRATION OF THE AFFECTIONS

AND

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON SOCIAL MORALITY

NATIONAL BOARD
YOUNG WOMENS CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATIONS
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
600 LEXINGTON AVE.
NEW YORK

HQ
C112c

Copyright of
The Consecration of the Affections
1913
Richard C. Cabot

Second edition, 1914

4-6-41

JUN 26 1964

THE following three lectures on the Consecration of the Affections were delivered by Dr. Richard C. Cabot of Boston before the third biennial conference of the Employed Officers Association of the Young Women's Christian Associations of the United States, held in Richmond, Virginia, April 16-18, 1913, and are printed by permission of this Association. The appended report of the Commission on Social Morality was presented by the Commission to the Fourth Biennial Convention of the Young Women's Christian Associations of the United States, immediately preceding the conference of the Employed Officers Association.

ETERNITY AND A PENNY PILL

There are some things (chocolate, for instance, or tracts, or paper drinking-cups) that can be shot out of a slot at you and hit their mark. You can apply them to their uses at once. It is the same with the facts fired at you through the window of his booth by the railroad information man. Such facts set you on your track or your train at once.

But when people ask for clear directions about the train to proficiency in violin playing, belief in immortality, or understanding of sex, they always miss their train. Sometimes they complain of the officials.

After a course of lectures on sex last year, some workers of my acquaintance handed in written quesions beginning, "What should I say to a young girl who," etc., and were disappointed when no definite answer was forthcoming. To illustrate the difficulties of an answer let us ask a few parallel questions:

What paint shall I use for a Madonna?

What are the best words to use in a love sonnet?

What is the best book on being a millionaire?

What kind of bread makes you popular and handsome?

What liniment makes one's sympathies most supple?

People rush to lectures on "sex hygiene," sometimes for good reasons, sometimes to satisfy morbid curiosity, but often with a pathetic hunger for the bread of life. In the hope of forestalling such disappointments the lecturer should hang up before them a sign reading:

"This lecture will not solve fundamental problems. Seek ye the Lord."

RICHARD C. CABOT, M.D.

In *The Survey* for April 19, 1913.

CONSECRATION OF THE AFFECTIONS

Lecture I

CONSECRATION OF THE AFFECTIONS

LECTURE I

1

I am not interested to come to you as a critic. I see you as persons having a unique opportunity to deal rightly with the problem which, as it seems to me, is being attacked wrongly by a large proportion of the people now dealing with it. I do not know what body in the country is going to deal with it rightly unless it be a body of such workers as I am now addressing. I feel great hope in this conference, not so much for what I shall impart to you, but for what I, as an outsider, may encourage you to do in your own way and not in some other way that might be thought newer and better.

The title I have chosen is in certain respects obscure. I will begin by giving you reasons for using it or something like it as the name we hold before ourselves and others in approaching the problem of the affectionate

relations of human beings and especially of men and women to each other, and the evils that may arise in connection with these relations.

The problem we are concerned with is, of course, the problem of chastity, the problem of purity as a virtue. Now there is something paradoxical in this or any other virtue. There is no virtue of any kind unless one feels temptation, no virtue in bravery where there is no tendency to run away, no virtue in truth unless one has a tendency to lie. When one thinks one possesses a virtue one must realize that a virtue means a victory over temptation, and never the absence of temptation. Chastity is more than innocence or ignorance, just as courage is more than insensitiveness to fear. One cannot speak of purity or chastity without making this clear at the outset. Neither does one mean what is sometimes called frigidity, that is, the knowledge of a given temptation without any personal sense of it, a head knowledge without a heart knowledge.

Neither does one mean by chastity anything which is implied in a life led under physical restraint. The murderer who tries to murder and whose pistol misses fire is physically

restrained from doing what he intended to do, but so far as virtue is concerned he has as little as the one who succeeds. So anyone physically free from evil relations has not necessarily chastity or purity; and this is equally true, though less obvious, when one is restrained not by physical bonds but by fear of physical consequences. One who remains in the path of what is called virtue merely for fear of physical consequences has nothing to do with the special topic with which we are dealing today.

Neither can we define chastity as the abstinence from certain acts, for if we did there could be no such phrase as "a chaste wife"; yet we must retain that phrase.

But, if we cannot use purity to mean simply innocence or ignorance, or the abstinence from certain acts, or the results of physical fear or restraint, we have, it seems to me, nothing left for a definition except this: the guidance and inspiration of a consecrating affection. That, I believe, is the ultimate meaning of purity or chastity—that in the presence of temptation one is guided by the power of a consecrated affection, a higher love. That is why I have spoken of "The Consecration of the Affec-

tions," as the shortest and at the same time the truest phrase I could use to convey the meaning of that which we want to achieve in the broad field across which we are looking today.

I wonder how many remember in "Tom Brown's Schooldays" the advice given by Tom Brown's father when Tom goes off to school. It was a moment when he might have given a good deal of specific warning against particular vices. But he chose to say merely this: "Don't do anything you would be ashamed to have your mother and sisters know." He does not warn against specific sins of any kind. Tom Brown's father trusted that in the presence of a higher affection, a consecrated affection, his boy would be kept safe, because the wrong and the right kind of affection could not inhabit the same tenement of clay at the same time.

The advantage of that dominance, that restraint by a positive and higher affection as against the kind of prohibitions which entice, is obvious. Tell a child not to do a certain thing and he has all the greater tendency to do it. And it is as true in love as in any other matter, that prohibitions may have the effect

of enticement, while the correcting power of a higher affection has no such dangers.

We as Christians should always think of chastity as guidance by a higher affection, and at last by the highest of all affections, the love of our Master. The most love-compelling personality, that which has the greatest power in holding us straight, is the personality of Christ.

So much for the general definitions and for the reasons why I have not called this topic "Sex Hygiene," or by any of the other terms ordinarily employed.

2

I do not believe that there should ever be a "special campaign" against unchastity like a campaign against tuberculosis, in which an evil is singled out and seen for the time being out of relation to all other things, and to the truths of Christianity. This is not a special campaign; it is merely a particular opportunity for Christian work, a new opportunity to get a hearing for the old truths, a new opportunity due to the particular openness of the public at the present time, and to the degree

to which such matters are talked about all over the country. This is the opportunity for Christians and an opportunity unequalled by that offered to any other body. You have had important work to do in other years, but I believe you have had no greater opportunity than this to bear witness to the truths of Christianity, and to bear witness with power. My object, then, is not to bring to you new facts, medical or physical; so far as these lectures go I want to take it for granted that you know of the facts of anatomy and physiology and disease, which it is not my business now to go over with you.

Those who are trying to prosecute this same "campaign" without manifesting at every point the Christian religion are acting to a very considerable extent upon the assumption that the *motive of fear* is the most important motive with which we can deal, and of which we can make use.

I have been dealing for twenty years with medical students; as a teacher and practitioner of medicine I have had to do with some thousands of them, and have been pretty intimate with a good many hundreds. Medical students, by reason of their studies, have to know

the facts of anatomy, physiology and disease on which many of the teachings of what is called sex hygiene appear to depend. These students know such facts better than I could present them to you or to any one concerned merely for morality; but I have never found that their knowledge of these facts made them any more chaste than other people, or any less so—rather it left them just about the average of men. Now, if the full knowledge of facts could hold people straight and make them behave themselves, medical students ought to be an ideal body of men. But they are not. Next to medical students, nurses, I suppose, know more of these facts than any other group, yet I have never found that nurses as a body behave any better than the average of the classes from which they were drawn. If a knowledge of facts could make people behave themselves, medical people generally would certainly be the leaders of the world in this matter; but they are not. We have, therefore, a sufficient answer to any who believe that fear of consequences, dread of disease and shame are powerful motives for good behavior in this field.

But there is a further and deeper reason for

our avoiding any teaching which builds upon the fear of consequences. It is not only an ineffective teaching, but one that does positive harm, because it teaches us to believe in a morality of consequences, which implies that it does not make any difference what you do so long as you do not get caught. That cannot but debase us and make us feel that consequences are the main issue in morality. All over the country there is already too much tendency to believe that to be found out is the great sin, and I think Christians have a special duty to insist on the religious view of the matter expressed in those wonderful words, "Against Thee, Thee only have I sinned," which state well the opposite view, that immorality is not primarily a matter of social disorder or inconvenience, nor a matter of personal misfortune or disease, but is a rupture of the relation between the soul and God, and ultimately nothing else.

I object very much, therefore, to the use of the term "hygiene" in this connection. The hygienist teaches you how to avoid consequences. Hygiene is like going out with an umbrella to avoid getting wet. That is the spirit of hygiene—to tell us what we can do

to avoid certain consequences of ill health. Suppose you said to a boy, "Do not steal, because you may be put in prison, and prisons are unhygienic!" Suppose you said to a woman, "Do not lie, because if you do you may have a case of bad conscience and lie awake at night; but insomnia is bad for the health." These are absurd instances, of course, but on the whole no more absurd or wrong than the sort of teaching we are getting, I regret to say, very largely from my profession, in this particular matter.

I am not saying, and have no wish to say, that a full knowledge of the facts of anatomy, physiology and disease is not of value. It is of great value to parents, to teachers, to workers like you, but not for the reasons that have been ordinarily advanced, not because it keeps anybody pure, but because, among other things, it is of value in counteracting misinformation. I do not mean to say that we should not deal in facts, even in warnings, but merely that they should be kept subordinate in the body of our essential constructive morality.

Are disasters in this field often due to ignorance of facts? As a medical man I have

been dealing with such disasters for twenty years, and I cannot recall a case in which any man or woman has done wrong and got into trouble because of ignorance of facts. I do not say such things never have been, or are impossible, but within my own experience a very small part of the evil has arisen from ignorance of facts.

If then we cannot depend upon such warnings, we naturally turn to education as the great way out of the problem of impurity or unchastity. "Sex-education" is in vogue today because of the failure of repressive measures. One rushes to education as a remedy in this or any other field when one finds that legislation and police regulation do very little good.

In the field of which we are speaking it is largely, I think, because of the total failure of repressive or warlike measures such as attacks upon houses of prostitution, attempts at regulation and segregation, that people are as enthusiastic as they are today about what is called education. Another thing that has made people enthusiastic about education is the failure of evasion—the evasions of parents in relation to the questions asked by their own

children. So people have come to feel that if we only stated all the facts clearly (which is what the majority mean by education) we should conquer.

In a large sense I heartily believe that education is the way out of unchastity, education in the sense that all Christianity is education. You and I, in so far as we are Christians, are so as the result of our education in the deeper sense. So if anyone asks if education is the way out, I would say yes and no; yes, if one takes it in the Christian sense, no, if one thinks of education as merely the conveying of information.

Why do many people feel dubious as to results obtained today in public schools? Because they fear that the schools are giving education largely in the shape of indigestible facts. The idea of curing or preventing unchastity by the statement of facts is like the attempt to live by bread alone. Yet education as *the imparting of life by greater life*—that surely is the remedy for this and all other evils.

I have a great reverence for science, as anyone who devotes his life to medicine must. I have very little reverence for what occurs in

one's mind as the result of memorizing facts. I have a great belief in the result of the discipline acquired by arranging or using the facts acquired. Anyone who goes through that discipline is getting character-training, something much deeper and greater than information. But in the kind of talks that are being given today under the name of "sex hygiene" there is no effort required from those who listen. They can snap up the facts given them without any exercise of spiritual muscles, without any concentration or control, such as true science always demands. In my attempt, therefore, to depreciate the value of such information I am not depreciating science.

I have already said that I think the special value of information in this field is to counteract misinformation, and that seems a perfectly definite though a very small part of our problem. You know the great mass of misinformation which floats about the community, especially among younger people of both sexes, on matters concerning chastity—such information, for instance, as that which states that it is unhealthy to lead a strictly continent life. Although there is no scientific backing for that fallacy there are people who sincerely

believe that a continent life is prejudicial to health. Hence it is our duty to deny it. It hardly seems as if it ought to need denial. How anyone can look at the training of athletes, in which the rules require always a straight life in this respect as well as in others—how anyone can know such facts and still hold to the old superstition about the unhealthiness of continence I cannot understand. But there are such people, and therefore true facts should be stated. Moreover, there are still people, I know, who believe that the fearful evil of prostitution can be met by the method called segregation, by the organization of a red light district and the attempt to keep all of the unfortunate women in that district. Now segregation is a total failure, because it does not segregate. It does not even do the very dubious thing which it says it does. In so far as misinformation is prevalent on any part of our subject we need to neutralize its poison. On the other hand, one does not want to give a drug to neutralize a poison unless the poison is really in the system. Only to the extent in which we believe poisons are in the body politic have we much use for the information that shall neutralize the poison.

We come next to a more modern stage of our problem, one in which many intelligent people still rest. They hope to cure or prevent unchastity by the study of biology and botany, by an appeal to the beauty and order of nature as seen in the lower forms of animal and plant life. I imagine that many of you are conversant with earnest Christian people who look with great hope on this particular means of combating the evil of which we are speaking. But there are certain things to be said against this view. People who wish to give children the right point of view on such matters often confuse two quite different things: namely, maternity and sex. Maternity and the facts about it, answering the familiar, innocent questions of children about the way in which children are born—all that is a comparatively simple and easy part of the problem. It is not difficult to make children understand, either with or without biological or botanical analogy. But it is not very important either, for we are still leaving the difficult field of sex untouched and unprepared. Biological and botanical analogies help to some extent in showing adults the beauty and greatness of maternity, but they do not help children a whit to see the

greatness and beauty of affection, to see the consecration of affection, to understand sex. We can take no model and no example from lower animals in this matter.

Again, in my own experience, biological and botanical study given for this purpose has usually had one of two effects: it has either bored the children and produced no impression, or it has made them cynical. It has either interested them vitally and eagerly but in the wrong way, or else it has failed to interest them at all. Usually it does no great harm and no great good. Small children are not as a rule interested in such things. If you do succeed in interesting them it is usually because, though you *seem* to be teaching biology or botany, you are really doing something else: you are giving of yourself. So far as biology and botany ever really helped in the effort to conquer temptation it is on account of the personality of the teacher.

Another reason why the methods to which I have been alluding, and which I have been depreciating, have been in vogue is our sense of the terrific bulk of evil confronting us and the feeling that *"something must be done,"* and done at once, and done for everybody.

That is true, in so far as it is possible. As Christian workers you have felt that a hundred times in relation to other problems. But I think if we are Christians we are pretty modest about anybody's ability to accomplish in the wholesale a change that is to affect anything as deep as character and virtue. It is easy to give lectures; it is very hard to have any great effect produced on anybody by talking. The essential thing by which we learn is not talk but practice, the contagion of personality.

3

I want to say something on *the Christian view of spirit and flesh.*

I suppose it has probably been your misfortune to read some of the books written in the last few years on what is called "sex hygiene." I have read very few which do not show traces of their own sense of the insufficiency of the teaching they are giving. "Teach the sacredness of the body" is a phrase very much in use. That is put alongside with teaching the facts of venereal disease, for instance, and it is clear by the juxtaposition of

such absolutely different things that the nature of the teaching is very vague.

Here are some of the phrases taken from various books of this sort: "Teach the sacredness of the body," "teach the beauty of physical facts," "teach the responsibility to the community," "teach a deep respect for self," "teach a reverence for manhood," "teach a sense of the marvels of nature," "teach the duty of self-mastery," etc.

Such admonitions are strung along with items of information as easy to impart as the day of the month. Yet you who have all done teaching of one kind or another, you all know that one enters a totally different world as soon as one turns from the domain of fact and aspires to teach any piece of spiritual apprehension such as is implied in these phrases about the sacredness of the body.

An article of great popularity a few years ago was called, "How I Told My Children." Do you *tell* children truthfulness? Nobody ever told a virtue or was told a virtue; you acquire a virtue and painfully build it up. You do not grow up by anything so easy as being told. Yet many people seem to think that to tell a person that the body is sacred or that mater-

nity is to be reverenced is all that is necessary to make them realize it. No amount of telling will necessarily have that effect. Can we teach the sacredness of any great thing by any method? Do we not know, even under most favorable conditions, that we often totally fail? We do not give up the effort, but we do face it with a great sense of difficulty.

Therefore we do not trust in exhibits and books and circulars and leaflets and talks to accomplish such a great thing as the development in any human being of a sense of the sacredness of life. Any virtue is acquired by the same methods that Christianity is acquired, namely, by long practice and the contagion of great personalities.

Returning to that phrase, used as typical of the present difficulties and mistakes, "Teach the sacredness of the body." We surely want to do that; but how are we to do it? What, in your experience or in mine, has made the body, or the hand or any other part sacred? I should say that the body is most sacred when it is most forgotten, forgotten because it has become subordinate as part in a wider whole. To the captain of an army, when he is leading the charge, his body, his voice, his eye, his

arm are of great use; his body may become sacred because he has almost forgotten that portion of himself in the wider whole of a more sacred purpose. When an artist is painting so that you and I want to look at his picture he has forgotten his technique, which is merged in a larger whole. In all the bodily acts that you think of as deeply valuable, the essential thing is the merging of each part so that one is not especially conscious of any.

To teach the sacredness of the body, then, means *helping some person by the contagion of example to such practice as enables him to forget it, to master it or to sacrifice it*. And that, of course, brings us back to the point with which we started; such teaching comes from the effect of a higher affection, from the more inclusive love which is consecration

The thing that makes it possible for the soldier leading a charge to forget his body is his intense love for that for which he is laying down his life. The thing that makes it possible for the artist to do great work and attain to great achievement is his hot desire for the great, consecrated whole of which his picture or his song is a part.

And yet, as you see, almost all that has been

associated with the teaching of this subject tends to make us conscious of the body separately and not as a part of a larger whole. It is from this standpoint, feeling that most of these efforts are on the wrong track, and remembering that because it is not the practice of the Christian to deal with the body in this isolated way, that I have such great hope of the work to be done by your organization.

CONSECRATION OF THE AFFECTIONS

Lecture II

CONSECRATION OF THE AFFECTIONS

Lecture II

1

Under the general topic of the Christian view of the relation of spirit and flesh I have said of the phrase "teach the sacredness of the body," that the body is most sacred when it is most forgotten, in any official or heroic action. Passing on to what I have called the common center of all virtues, I assert that we cannot teach separately any specific virtue, such as courage, truthfulness or chastity, because the study and practice of any one of these takes a lifetime, and also because we should all become prigs by doing it that way. To avoid that, we can teach ourselves or anyone else *by sharing our enthusiasms.*

The lifelong task, the long road of art, is the effort of the artist to share his enthusiasm with you and me, through the medium of canvas or marble or music. You have certain

enthusiasms, and the best thing you can do for any human being is to share them. The whole of the teacher's art can be phrased in the same way. The teacher of history who shares no enthusiasm for history will do no good.

Anyone, therefore, who is trying to teach chastity recognizes first of all that all the virtues spring out from a common center, as spokes of wheels do from the hub, and support each other as the spokes of the wheel with their periphery support each other. That common center is the love of personalities or of anything that a human being can love. In so far as you direct the attention to anything you care for deeply, you are teaching all the virtues at once.

Why are you and I as truthful as we are, and no more so? Because of the measure of admiration we have conceived for people who are more truthful than we. Why have we as much courage as we have, and no more? For precisely the same reason. And in the field of which we are speaking, why are we no better and no worse than we are? *Because of the enthusiasms we have shared.*

That common center, then, of all virtues,

is the key to all ethics, and the attempt to teach any virtue separately is a lifelong task and concentrates one's attention upon one's self instead of making one look off and admire some one else.

The kind of contagion by which any one of us gets from another person whatever powers he has, is exemplified in the contagion of anything funny. And in the same way anything that any one else admires greatly in a less degree excites yourself. I remember my father's reading aloud to us children and how we caught the enthusiasm which he did not express but could not help showing for what he was reading.

To share our enthusiasms we have to cut away the dead wood that obscures the beautiful scene. The artist cuts out what is unessential in the landscape or in his picture, and shows what is great. So anybody who is trying to share something he cares for, illuminates the essential points. It is an art that we all must practice all our lives.

A great deal is said about the force of example. I am trying to show that the greatest force we can exert is by making the example of *other people* count. The thing we

never should attempt to do is to make our own example count. That seems to me always to be wrong, but what we can do that seems to be right is something nearly opposite. When you are trying to share your enthusiasms, as the artist does, you are trying to make somebody else love something. But when it comes to yourself and your own doings the current is reversed, and you should aim yourself to care for that other person, not to make the other person care for you.

As a physician, of course I see a great many people in trouble—every kind of trouble—of mind, body and estate, and often in the sort of trouble we are talking about in these lectures. I find that I never can help any such persons unless I can get to care for them. If I remain bored I cannot help them. And on the other hand, I have found that in so far as I do get to care for such people the very knowledge and feeling of caring tends to hold them up; after that anything they do hurts me, and that knowledge holds them up. To turn attention to what is admirable, and to exert upon people any human appreciation you have, is all in line with Christian teaching. It is to the person of Christ that we try

forever to turn our attention and others' attention, sharing thus the greatest of our enthusiasms.

2

Next, I come to the question of frankness and its relation to modesty. A great deal that is written and spoken nowadays contains the silent implication that the virtue of modesty is an outgrown affair, and that we today, in accordance with the revelations of science, have no use for it. As a result of this idea much is said under the name of "frankness" that does not deserve praise. I want to give you certain weapons in defense of this quality of modesty against attacks, some open and some covert, which you are sure to meet in one way or another in the coming five years. What is the solid basis of modesty in contrast with the idea that one can just as well speak or write of one thing as another?

It is said, "To the pure all things are pure"; it is also said that nothing is unclean or improper in itself, and there is no reason why we should not deal with anything in any company. The answer to that seems to me to be

contained in the nature of our minds and in the relationship of our minds to our bodies. It is a general law of mental or spiritual action that if our minds interfere in a province where they do not belong, we get into trouble. Here is a very simple example. Most of us are unaware, fortunately, of the condition of the inside of our own mouths. We do not often get our minds fixed on this unimportant matter. *It is very easy to get your consciousness dislocated,* however, so that you are in trouble. If you begin to consider the condition of the inside of your own mouth you will find in about a minute and a half that you have too much saliva. Before your attention was fixed on it there was no such condition. This is an illustration of the relation between mind and body and of the hair balance existing between normal and abnormal consciousness. You can say, "To the pure all things are pure—why should not the human being think about the inside of his own mouth?" Well, I have shown you why.

The same law holds in other fields. We are not meant to be conscious of the fact that we have a heart. As physicians go through their work they see a good many sick people who

are sick because they have been made conscious that they have a heart. Just as soon as you turn the light of consciousness on your heart you begin to have trouble. When you have a pain in the left side of your chest the chances are forty-nine to fifty that you have not got heart disease, or when you have a pain across the small of your back the chances are that you have not got kidney disease, but the effect of many advertisements that we see in newspapers is to dislocate consciousness on these points. It it not a matter of imagination, it is a concentration of attention, which in itself makes things actually work wrong. We are not meant to think or speak or write of everything in heaven and earth, in every company and at every time. Our consciousness is meant to be like the light upon a picture, brilliant in some respects, mild in others and quite dark in others. When people try to tell you, therefore, that one subject of conversation or writing is as good as another, and that modesty is false modesty, I think you will find that I have suggested to you a satisfactory answer.

These reflections suggest a deeper thought, namely, that we are not a perfectly regulated

mechanism which will run by itself forever in a natural way, but that we are on the edge of disaster all the time. Explosions of one kind or another are always likely to take place and we must know enough to avoid them. I think, myself, that this is connected with what Christians call "original sin"—that there is a flaw in us so deep that we are going to get into trouble, unless *through modesty, through self-control, through higher enthusiasms, we get away from the environment that tends to explosion.* These explosions are more dangerous and more common in men, and while it is true that most of your dealings are with women, it is essential that you should realize that one great difficulty in the field of affection, often miscalled sex, is in this tendency to explosiveness which is much greater on the part of the male than the female. Everybody knows that one should keep a certain distance away from an explosion, and this habit of keeping at a distance from temptation is one of the things that anybody who is helping himself or anybody else to keep safe has to understand.

Tolstoy went to an extreme in this matter. He said that the ordinary evening dress of a woman was a sin because of its tendency to

produce explosions; that such dress meant playing with fire and we ought not to allow it for that reason. Whether we think Tolstoy was wrong in that particular or not, we must clearly see that something parallel is true in every field. The drunkard knows that he cannot go more than just so near to a saloon near to where he lives, though one may be running in another street without getting him into trouble. Now and then we see a man wise enough to keep his distance. My own particular type of explosions is a library. I always find that to go into a library results in disaster. I go in with half an hour to spend and I spend five. That is perhaps ridiculous to you, and in a way it is to me, but it is also really a serious matter. I will venture to say there is not one of you for whom there is not something that bears that same relation to your life that a library does to mine. That is parallel to the reason for modesty. One must keep one's distance from certain topics, because of the explosive effect of all that comes of the relation of flesh and spirit, a relation which seems to me part of "original sin," whereby we are not to be trusted in some respects.

Part of the education which Christian workers should give concerns these explosions and the events and feeling which lead dangerously near them.

Now this is the proper place for repression. We hear a great deal about the uselessness of repression. We are told that to discipline a child by repression will not get you anywhere, that you must discipline by methods that interest him, rather than try to enforce a law. But there is a place for repression. We should repress and avoid anything in ourselves that has a tendency to go too near what causes an explosion. One can do away with some types of evil only by this method.

3

This brings to me the subject of the *control of imagination.* One hears of the control of temper, but I venture to say that there is nearly as much danger in lack of control of imagination as in lack of control of temper. I know a group of social workers in my own city, women as high-minded, I think, as any group of women who could be found in the country, who were attending a series of

lectures and who were told to read a certain book. I believe a good many of them have had hard times with themselves since then, because certain images were put into their minds which it was very hard for them to get out. The control of imagination comes down at bottom to concentration. A person who has learned by discipline of any kind the art of concentration finds that it applies in a great many fields. For instance, shyness and stage fright result from lack of concentration upon the subject. No one gets stage struck without becoming conscious of himself, and that is always in consequence of lack of concentration. The same thing that controls the rest of consciousness, then, controls one's imagination. Modesty and restraint are virtues now and always, for the reasons which I have been trying to give.

There are certain words which in their mere use do harm, and one of them is the ordinary use of the word "sex." Such use splits body and soul apart where God has joined them together. Suppose a dancer suddenly becomes conscious of a physical element, his feet; you know his dancing will be spoiled; the physical element is there, and ought to be, but it is not

right that it should be severed from the spiritual and mental. Singers sometimes get into trouble by thinking too much of their larynxes; the best singers know that this means making an effort where there should be no effort; the people who have learned to place their voices do not do it in that way. Physical training almost never succeeds in turning our minds altogether to the physical, but it sometimes comes near it. The ideas in Blaikie's book, "How to Get Strong," are, I believe, un-Christian ideas, in that they make this effort; and they do not work because we do not get health when we fix our attention on aught but that which is the whole man. It is just as bad to try to train the mind separately. Anyone who tries to do mental work by itself knows that it is not a success. For a Christian there should be no physical training and no mental training as separate things, because the two are meant to go together.

The physical side of affection never acts alone except in the insane or idiotic, and when it does it is absolutely blameless, as blameless as it would be to fall out of a window on to some one and kill him. If sex could be considered separately in that way it would be

simply such blind action as the action of gravitation, for which we should in no way be to blame.

This is not merely a logical quibble. There is in human nature a great tendency to this split between the spiritual and physical sides of affection, and it is widened when we allow assaults on it by such words as "sex," "sex hygiene," etc. Their union is just what needs recognition and encouragement. That split goes deep in human life, and in many other things besides affection. It enters into practical matters and into art. There are parallel dangers, in work, in play, in worship and in everything else that a human being does. Just because that is the case, it is our business to do all we can to heal this breach. There should be no merely spiritual love. I would carry that point as far as it can be carried. Take your own personal relation to Christ. Is not that an absolutely spiritual thing? If your feeling is more respect than love, I believe it is not the right kind, for no one can feel his pain and hear his voice with that kind of affection. It needs the body to suffer and thrill with his experiences. It seems to me that many of our Roman Catholic brethren

know more than we do, in that they have kept the realization of the physical life, as well as the rest, in the thought of the crucifixion. No one can say that his devotion is purely spiritual if the devotion is real, because that would exclude us from sympathy with one of the most human and divine acts of Christ's life—his crucifixion.

Another error that you ought to prepare to fight is that fallacy, very commonly mentioned ten years ago, about what is called sexual need as compared with our human need of food. In the first place this is medically false. There is no such need, comparable to the need of food. Further than that, the phrase seems blasphemous, because it implies that all the continent people, all the unmarried, are blighted in their lives because they are not allowed to get what they are supposed to need. It seems to me the *Christian law is that human beings are made to be perpetually unsatisfied, and ought to be so.* All affection has, and ought to have in it this perpetual hunger and unsatisfied element, and it is just as true of those happily married and fortunate in their affections as of anyone else. St. Augustine meant this when he said, "Thou madest us for

Thyself, and our soul is restless until it shall repose in Thee." We have a longing for God that is never satisfied on earth, and all forms of affection, both mental and physical, whether vague and general or more conscious, both pure and impure, are sacred or can be made so because they are the unsatisfied attempt at the expression of our eternal longing for God. We know, if we are familiar with young people, how the feeling of religion springs up at the adolescent period because the love and the religion represent the same fundamental hunger and impulse, and both are apt to be over-emotional. In a happy marriage, each one of the pair is a revelation to the other of what God is and should be, and yet in the best marriages there is always and ought always to be, this hungry element.

Closely akin to this is the parallel error of supposing that marriage is the only normal state for a human being. Marriage has been the greatest happiness in my life, yet I am clear that the Lord did not mean everybody to be married, and that the satisfaction of the hunger of the human soul is the desire of the married as of the unmarried. No one who thinks of Joan of Arc can think that marriage

is the only perfection for human life! People are looking for the center of the universe, for the central spirit of the universe, and they may find it in marriage or they may not. People very often marry themselves to their work or to their country's service, and find as great satisfaction there, as much of God, as others do in marriage.

The fundamental longing, then, in human body and mind is the longing for God. Sex, so-called, is one aspect of that longing, patriotism is another, and the reaching out after science and truth and beauty are others, but none of these is any more fundamental than the others. The desire for children, a very fundamental desire in many of us, seems to me at bottom a desire to create. This desire everybody has, and everybody can satisfy—a desire to see *something* grow, something which is the child of our own exertions, or our own body and will. That is excluded from no one, nor is it ever fully satisfied in any one. On the other hand it seems un-Christian to hold, as many do, that marriage exists solely for the sake of children, for then all childless marriages would be wrong as well as a failure. Marriage exists as a means to the better ser-

vice of God, for the great ends for which we were created, one of which, and only one, is children; marriage exists also for the mutual stimulus, help and comfort of two human souls.

I have spoken of one word, "sex," which seems to illustrate the harmful tendency to split body from mind as they should not be split. There are many other such words. Recently I was reading over the syllabus of a course of so-called sex education and I found a good many words that it seemed to me should not occur so frequently in a document put out by a Christian body. I see altogether too much about "ideals." All of us have lived by ideals, but no ideal is as good as a fact, and we ought to relate the sex life, first, last and all the time, to the highest of facts—the life of Christ. The highest of human beings and divine beings, then, are not ideals. An ideal is something disembodied; we want to talk more about incarnate spirit; we want to talk of facts incarnate in human people and the possible devotion to personalities, human or divine, which can guide and control us. There is great danger in all this talk about ideals. You will find in Buddhistic theories the separation

of soul from body and the use of such vague words as "ideals," "essences," "powers," "planes," etc.

Another type of danger is such a word as "wholesome." We are told that we need to arouse a "wholesome interest." That is too physical a word. A person may be absolutely "healthy" and yet absolutely impure. Wholesomeness does not get us far enough; it is good as far as it goes, but the facts of religion and human life are much greater and more practical than that.

The next word that we use too much is the word "social," "social welfare," etc. We are told to interpret all these new impulses in terms of social welfare. That is very much too vague and on the whole too materialistic a metaphor. Social is no better than individual. There is no special benefit in simply having more of the same sort of people; it is the consecration of all the people here on earth that we look for, and phrases like "social welfare," while they have a perfectly real use, should never be put by Christians into anything that represents their best effort to state what they would do to help each other.

4

I come now to the consideration of chastity as the consecration of affection and will speak first of the nature of consecration in the relation of two human beings. I quote the beautiful phrase "Deep calleth unto deep," as the essential characteristic of the consecrated relation of two human beings, the best of one human being leaping out to meet the other, the best of body as well as soul, the best of incarnate spirit. In contrast take some examples of unconsecrated meetings. Take the familiar matter of meeting when we come down in the morning. We say "Good morning." I have seen that morning greeting done in a very unconsecrated way, have not you? I have seen people come in about half awake, shuffling in, torpid, cold, with stereotyped voice, all that is the very opposite of consecrated, all that is superficial and unsatisfactory. When we are like that it is not merely in ourselves that the sense of consecration is lacking; we see the person before us like a face in a crowd, or like an image that has no meaning for us; we do not really see that immortal soul, that particular human being whom we know down at

bottom to be infinitely precious. We are not awake ourselves and have not made the reality of the other person awake to us. In contrast with this, think of the meaning that can be put into these old familiar words, "Good morning," when all our reminiscences of the past and aspirations for the future are there, and all the blessings of the spirit rush out into these two words. That is the consecration of affection.

The imprisoned energy of the best in us calls across the distance and meets with something that is the best in the other person. To a child its toys are often consecrated objects. I have seen little girls to whom their dolls were really consecrated articles, the divine symbol of motherhood, symbols of the deep calling unto deep, while the onlooker sees nothing but the battered, scarred remains of what was a doll. So it is with the church symbols; the symbol of the Lord's Supper, if it is real, is so because in it deep calleth unto deep, because you bring the best that is in you and call to the deeps of our Lord's nature, and receive the depth of that nature. On the other hand, just as you can look at the poor old doll and see nothing, while the little girl

sees worth and beauty, so I can remember when I looked on that grand sacrament and thought it not only uninspiring but wholly ridiculous. There is no movement that cannot be made secular by lack of vigor and fidelity. And there is nothing that cannot become consecrated in so far as these elements are present and deep calls unto deep.

CONSECRATION OF THE AFFECTIONS

Lecture III

CONSECRATION OF THE AFFECTIONS

Lecture III

1

Yesterday I tried to define a consecrated affection as that in which deep calls to deep, in which the best in us calls to the best in some one else; and in the different types of consecration of which I speak today I still hold to that central idea. I want to speak to you of affection and its team-mates within the soul, by which it is backed up, enriched, and finally consecrated.

The first of these team-mates I shall speak of as the elemental. That sounds abstract, but I hope to get to detail in a moment.

I had a good many friends who went through the San Francisco earthquake and fire, where certainly there was that "touch of nature," of the elemental, that we have often heard "makes the whole world kin." In the recital of what impressed people most in that great disaster, the thing that has most forcibly

struck me has been, not the horror and the terror of it, but the extraordinary human brotherhood of the first forty-eight hours, at the time when no one had any more than anyone else. When all differences were wiped away, and people stood in line for their milk or bread at the supply depots, they felt their human oneness and for the time were conscious of a real human brotherhood. That exemplifies the re-inforcement of a rather feeble sense of brotherhood among people like the San Franciscans, or like ourselves, by the elemental. This is a very important sort of experience. Those of us who have had anything to do with camping trips know how people who start out with more or less indifference to each other, after a week of paddling, chopping wood, cooking, eating and sleeping under the stars together, without doing much talking, without much of the ordinary means by which friendship is strengthened, come home more intimate than they would have become after years of any other kind of acquaintance. Feeble, elemental bits of affection in us can be strengthened and consecrated by the touch of nature which does make people kin in the sense I have shown.

It has been very striking to me as a physician, through my experience in hospital work, to note the uniting power of the elemental facts of illness. You have noticed, perhaps, how the members of a family who may not be any too fond of each other under ordinary circumstances, draw into the closest oneness if any one attacks that family or any member of it. The individual citizen does not care specially about his city, but if any one attacks the city his patrotism blazes up. In illness it is something like that; something has attacked the whole human race; disease, an enemy of human life, has attacked one member of the human family, and all the family are drawn together and united in repelling that attack.

This seems to me the fundamental reason why the elemental facts of sickness and disease have a spiritual value in drawing people together. Anyone who has dealt with the sick has seen how marvelously easy it is to make friends and keep them under these circumstances. There are those in our time—and I have the deepest respect for them—who feel that religion and the higher things of life should have nothing to do with matter and

flesh. I have been trying to insist that such is not a Christian view, even though it may be held by a Christian Scientist, because Christianity demands the incarnation of spirit in flesh and the resisting of all attempts to take them apart.

Have you noticed how constantly Christ uses the material side of things, the elemental as I have called it, as the entering point in his closest relations to people? When he met the woman of Samaria at the well he doubtless wanted in the end the closest relation to her soul. He wanted to "reach" that person. Did you ever notice his particular point of attack? "Give me to drink"—the elemental fact at first, the material fact of water made the entering point of his meeting with her. Passing by all material evidence in the miracles, think of such an event as preceded his parting from his disciples at the Last Supper, when he wanted most closely to draw them to himself, and himself to them; the thing he did, a thing which in our time sounds almost grotesque, was to wash the disciples' feet. It does us good to ponder on that now and then, to imagine it, see it and feel it.

Then think of the material side in the Last

Supper and how at his death he was not willing that we should forget the material, the fleshly side in his incarnation, how in the crucifixion we are never allowed to forget the intimacy of union of spirit and flesh that was the center of his revelation to the world. As Christian people we ought to keep this sort of thing in mind and realize how in the examples I have earlier given, the depth of affection, the winning forces of affection, may be increased through contact with nature, through contact with the elemental, and that in our desire to exalt the spirit we need not depreciate the flesh.

Affection, then, is consecrated and reinforced by touch with the elemental, and further by touch with art. Any one of us who cares for music must have noticed how in coming out from some concert that he has cared for he feels much closer to his friends, how all his affections for those he sees and joins with are quickened by the impetus of that music. The beauty of any art re-enforces personal affections. Many a husband and wife who have gone to the theatre together with their affections jaded and dull, have come home loving each other better because of the

impetus of art. One of the greatest values in the right kind of theatrical art is its power to re-inforce our human affections. I wonder how many remember the second scene of the second act of Lohengrin, a scene which, if treated by a modern French writer or any one who did not think supremely of the things of the spirit, might be far from elevating—the scene where Lohengrin and Elsa are together in their chamber after their marriage, and how their love for each other is concentrated when he goes to the window and lets in a flood of spring moonlight. The concentration of affection by the beauty of nature, the force of the beauty of the spring night, turns that whole scene into something sacred.

I referred yesterday to Tolstoy's criticisms as to human behaviour and affection. In a book of his called "What is Art?" Tolstoy decides in the course of many pages what it is not, and only reaches in the last few pages what it is. I do not altogether agree with his definition, but it is very enlightening. He assumes that most so-called art is bad and harmful, but that there is a little that is really good, such, for instance, as is exemplified when a group of peasants who have been harvesting

in the fields all day, as they walk home together from their work, sing together some simple folk-song and *find in it their affections re-enforced.* The kind of art that is really art, he claims, is the kind that increases human affection. I should not make the definition quite so strict, but we can see what he refers to.

Affection is re-enforced and consecrated not only by art and by elemental nature but by all that appeals to patriotism. Any one who has read the biographies of our Civil War, of the men of that time, of the knitting of affection between husband and wife, families and members of families that came through the baptism of the fire of love of country, or state, will remember and realize what I mean. Love, beauty, patriotism and the elemental are team-mates in our natures, and our love is braced and strengthened by these team-mates when we call them to our aid, not allowing them to fall out, as, in the pressure of modern life, with its specialization, we sometimes allow them to do. Whatever is whole-hearted re-enforces affection.

A characteristic example of this is seen after a college football game, when if the home

team wins you may see a variety of gentlemen hugging each other in a whole-hearted and agreeable manner.

To a body of working people like this I do not need to say much about the consecrating value of *work* in its relation to affection. You who have been working together do not need to be reminded of what common work may do in binding us, not only to those we work for, but to those we work with. I do not need to say more than a word about the effect of common worship on human affections. I think I do need, however, to say that in proportion as any one of these things calls out a great force in us it rouses also a great peril. There is not one of these things in which I am not aware of great dangers—explosions, as I have earlier called them—and I would not except one, not even common worship. The greatest things have the greatest dangers.

2

I want to speak next of the consecration of affection by another type of enrichment, an enrichment similar to that which I have already mentioned, and yet different. I may have some trouble in making clear my mean-

ing on this point, but with your help and faith perhaps I can succeed.

I believe it is true that all the types of affection, fraternal, maternal, filial, conjugal, comradely, are implicit one in the other so that each needs every other, and so that a richer harmony is made by reason of their presence each in each. You are familiar with the fact that many a good wife is fully as much of a mother to her husband as she is a wife. She often treats her husband very much like a grown-up son, and is all the dearer to him on that account. That is a familiar thought, but it can lead us further. I remember a little girl of seven, very much her mother's daughter, who one night was sleeping on an outdoor porch with her mother. As the clouds came up and threatened a storm she awoke before her mother did, and feeling the approach of the storm, got up to pull over her mother the bedclothes and throw on the rubber blanket that was kept there for such occasions. As she was doing this the mother, who had awakened, heard the little girl pouring out a string of reassurances, words of comfort and endearment. She was mothering her own mother.

We have all seen things like this. We have

seen the filial become maternal and yet remain filial. The next morning the little girl was just as much the little girl as ever. I think again of a little niece of mine, in whom I think of all conceivable human affections blended. I want to guard her, to think for her, to shield her as any one would his own daughter; I want to play with her as any one would with a comrade; I look up to her almost as I would to her father and her mother; and when she blesses me by putting her hand into mine I thrill with her touch as any husband might at the touch of a wife; and all these experiences so blend and interfuse as to re-enforce each other and enrich the harmony of affection.

In the greatest affections all types of affection are present. Every husband and wife should be good friends, not *merely* good friends but *also* good friends. I have spoken of "the affections" in this way because I think we want to keep them separate and also to unite them. I should make no exception to this, but include the divine love in the same organic whole of affection. I should like to make a little clearer how the element of infinite or divine love enters into our personal, intimate relations. I had a good friend in college,

a very good friend, a very sensible man in most respects. He had one peculiar habit. He kept a diary. In that diary he put down all sorts of strange things, among them a list of his friends ranked strictly in the order of their friendship, though he reserved the right to shift them. The thing that interests me in that peculiar story is that it is so obviously ridiculous. People always ridiculed my friend's dairy and its ranked favorites. What is it in the world that can be properly ranked and put in order, Whatever is finite. You can put cities or houses or populations or weights of babies in order and say which is greater and lesser and less, but the moment you touch anything infinite it is impossible to put it in order. You cannot compare two infinites. Take the infinite past and the infinite future, and you cannot compare them. You can compare anything finite and nothing more. It is for that reason that we cannot compare human beings, because of the infinite possibilities in them. That is a familiar and simple example and we do not need to rise to any great heights to see the significance of it, but it proves how infinite love mingles on intimate terms with finite.

Another obvious example is in the case

where Christ was asked, "How many times shall I forgive a brother?" In the answer, "Unto seventy times seven" he did not mean four hundred and ninety, he meant an infinite number of times, times absolutely without end; and that capacity for infinite forgiveness, which is the capacity of any honest, simple human love, shows the presence in any one of us of divine love, of the divine spark, as we say.

It is obvious that there are certain human relations in which one cannot forgive an infinite number of times, in an official position, for instance. There is a limit to the number of mistakes which we can excuse in a subordinate. But the important thing to remember there is that you have to distinguish between the official relation with its essentially finite qualities, and your human relation to the same human person you are dealing with, which is infinite, and in which your human affection and forgiveness have no end.

I remember that my own mother, as a member of a school committee, always had put upon her—I could guess why—the duty of telling superannuated teachers that it was their time to go. The thing which impressed me, in

those fateful interviews between certain poor teachers and my mother, was that after those interviews they came out still loving her as a friend, because she never allowed them to feel that her relation to them was merely an official relation.

I would like to sum up the different things I have been saying in relation to the different types of affection, finite and infinite, and the way in which they fuse and interpenetrate, and to do this I would use the scriptural phrase, the "house of many mansions." Imagine a house in which every room opened into every other room. It is precisely in that way that every human affection ought to have an opening into every other human affection. Imagine that that house had open windows throughout, so that each room was penetrated by the infinite outside, so that the winds of the infinite spirit could and must sweep through any and all of the rooms. That is the only figure I can think of that really conveys the facts of human affection and human nature in its relation to the divine—each room, each part, open to all the rest, getting the strength and purification of the infinite spirit throughout.

Finally, in this particular connection, I would call to your minds a saying of Christ which, while it doubtless has a thousand more meanings, certainly has this: "Inasmuch as ye did it to the least of these ye did it unto me." Of course, as Christians we all believe that. We do not always put the same interpretation on it. But it involves a structure of intercommunication of human beings with each other and with Christ. Inasmuch or just as much as you exert love towards any human being you exert it towards Christ, and as much as you exert it toward Christ you exert it towards all human beings. I think we often fail by not taking the Scriptures literally enough and also by taking them too literally. Here I think we cannot be too literal. If I strike this table before me with my hand, the force of the blow is transferred to all the universe, because the vibration goes through the structure of the table, through the floor of the house and the roof and on through all the universe, by physical law. Inasmuch as you exert the force of love upon any human being, because of this law of continuity and the connection of every human being with every other and with the infinite, you exert

it unto Christ. That seems to me a literal fact, not an ideal, but a fact that we can verify as we verify the facts of physics.

One application of this I would like to make, such as any one of us might use in our work of trying to help any one else to a higher affection. If a man is tending to treat a woman unfairly, wrongly, bring out the brotherly element in his feeling for her. He is not treating her as he would treat a sister, and yet there is bound to be in his love a certain brotherly element. She might be his sister: if so he would not treat her that way.

3

There ought to be a creative or contributory spirit in affection. We have to meet each other more than half way. We have to meet as Newton met the falling apple. We have seen falling apples all our lives, but we have never met them in the way in which he met the apple. He went a good deal more than half way. This is the genius of affection which goes farther than yours and mine, which goes as far as creating and discovering. We have to meet each other as Christ met the

woman who poured out the box of ointment and was so chidden for wastefulness by the onlookers. He certainly met that act, which some people might have called a mistaken act, more than half way. What we want is the *attitude of welcome* to that which is trying to be, but which is still very inchoate, still elemental and slight. Do you remember a wonderful passage in Shakespeare's Henry Fifth, in the scene before Harfleur? There is a pause in the siege, the soldiers are resting, leaning on their scaling ladders, trying to get breath before the next assault. Henry has been speaking to them, trying to call out their best energies, calling on all that is sacred to them in home and family; finally he says this wonderful thing: "I see you stand like greyhounds in the slips, straining upon the start." He saw them *with the eye of faith* straining upon the start, and after he had said it they strained a great deal more. He goes on: "Follow your spirit and upon this charge, Cry, God for Harry, England, and St. George!" That is what is called "suggestion" in the technical language of modern psychology, and the Henry Fifth of Shakespeare was one of the greatest masters of suggestion that the

world has ever known. That is what I mean by the contributory spirit as a spirit of consecration in affection.

4

Noble affection is full of symbolism.

Symbolism is apt to be taken either as a matter of mere fancy, like an interest in heraldry or the designs on old china, or is looked upon, especially by Protestants, with considerable suspicion, as being something like the worship of images or some dangerous ritualistic practice. Yet I want to remind you of the constant necessity of symbolism in any spiritual life. Every word spoken or written is a symbol: literally a spoken word is a grunt or a cough, a noise in the larynx; spiritually it is a symbol. You learn to interpret certain grunts and coughs and noises in the larynx and to recognize them as having spiritual meaning, but every time you use or hear a word you are using a symbol just as much as you are in the Lord's Supper. We Anglo-Saxons in general are very poor in the use of symbols; almost the only symbolic act in ordinary life is the act of bowing, and as it is ordinarily performed by the average male you

know it is not always a very beautiful symbol. Still it is of value, and we must meet it more than half way as we do other symbolic acts. I have seen a college president bow to the applicant for honors in a way which will never be forgotten by any who have seen it. The act of uncovering the head in the street when a dead body is carried by, or the act of kneeling as when a mother kneels by her child's bedside, or as we kneel in prayer, have infinite symbolic values, and such acts are all too few in our lives.

Christianity, more than any other religion, is and should be concerned in symbols, because it is the religion of the incarnation of spirit in flesh. We are familiar with the use of symbols in baptism and the Lord's Supper, but in all the least acts of life we should have symbolism. "The least of these" acts may be made symbolic. Medical work, nursing work, is full of symbolic acts—lifting a patient, watching him at night, feeding him, coming at his call are deeply symbolic acts. A symbol has the power to call up a huge mass of meaning behind it; a huge mass of precious experience can be focused and presented in a symbol. Take the marriage vow as a symbol: how it

calls up all the past of those two people and calls in all the future! In the presence of that great crowd of witnesses they are taking their vow, "in sickness and in health, for better, for worse": they call in the future and ask it to stand beside them there and witness; all these facts are mystically present in that momentary vow as our Lord is mystically present in the Lord's Supper.

I turn from such general symbolism to the special symbolism of affection, which is particularly in need of interpretation just now. The symbolism of affection is great and true, because of the incarnation, because of the union of spirit and flesh; and yet its meaning is often the hardest of all to see, and especially in the most sacred and intimate of unions of flesh and spirit, in married life. That is consecrated as all symbols are consecrated, by what they stand for, by what they mean, what has gone before and what is to come. One can get this more easily through thinking of the symbol of a hand-clasp. That *can* be very far from a consecrated act. Think of the flabby, the icy, the nervous, and all the other miserable types of hand-clasps, and then think of the splendid and satisfactory type.

We all know what a wonderful symbol that hand-clasp can be, what a wealth of meaning can be packed into it. It has often been said that in moments of great danger, when death seems near, a man will run over in his mind in a few seconds the whole of his past life, calling up the events of it with incalculable swiftness as he feels that his end is near. In the same way a hand-clasp is a great symbol because of the meanings, past and future, that can be put into it.

You will excuse me for going into personal experiences when I want to be sure that I speak of real fact and not merely of ideals. In 1898 I was saying good-bye to my father as I was going to the Spanish War. That war turned out to be a slight and trivial affair, with none of the dangers that were expected; but we did not know that beforehand. I was going at a time when the danger of yellow fever was supposed to be very great, and I remember, as any one will in similar experiences, how in the hand-grasp with my father our thoughts went back over the life we had lived together, the possibilities of the future, the meaning and the pledges that might go beyond the grave. I remember the feeling that

went into that hand-grasp, the pledges of mutual faith and trust. We have all known how this linking of flesh to flesh, how this joining of two pieces of flesh can become a wonderful symbol. Now apply this symbolism to all the intimacies of life. In such a joining of flesh in the spirit of hope and faith there always comes something new; the child of that moment springs out alive. Ardent people always create something new in their meetings and friendships; that is the law of life in the deepest sense. By that symbolism of affection the meeting of flesh and spirit should always create a child of that flesh and spirit, as live, ardent people strike fire out of each other. Every hand-clasp may be a creative act and noble human affections show it to be creative.

5

I pass now to *choice in contrast with impersonality, choice* as a consecrator of affection.

Human beings are made unique. There are no two faces alike, no two finger-prints alike, no two handwritings alike; yet we forget this and do not live up to it in our spiritual relations. We do not treat each other always as

unique, yet our faces and finger-prints and writings prove that we are. That is the sin of impersonality which enters into affection and degrades it, whereas the recognition of the uniqueness of personality consecrates it.

The greatest love is the love which has in it the choice of one and only one in the universe. The baser types of love are base because of their lack of choice, of their impersonality, and not because they are "merely physical." You have seen, perhaps, a baby two or three years old, in the slums of the city, working his way through the crowd and fending off the legs of the grown-ups as though they were posts. That sort of thing is laughable in a baby, but not in a grown-up. We can treat people as posts, bump against them and ward them off only in babyhood. But some of us have never grown up and still go on treating people like posts and bumping against them impersonally.

The baser forms of love, then, and the lower forms of religion—any forms except the Christian—tend to be impersonal. The superiority of Christianity lies in its personality. And the most awful thing in the most desecrated human affection—I still insist that it

shall be called human and shall be called affection—the most awful thing in prostitution is this impersonality; that there is no distinction—that is the terrible and obvious fact. Yet we are moved to be charitable even in thinking of that when we notice that in the lives of every one of us there is *some* impersonality. We do not always recognize the unique human soul before us; we do sometimes behave like stuffed lay figures and treat others as the same. When the conductor takes your ticket in the train do you always think of him as a unique human being with a family at home? Every one of us is stained with the sin of impersonality in some part of his life, and so we can be charitable with those others who are stained with the same sin, which is the root of the baser kind of love.

6

Next I want to speak of loyalty in affection. Loyalty has its opposite in literalism. Loyalty means seeing through the letter to the spirit. I lived one summer among a community of people who in their human relations seemed as stupid as they were keen and bright in their

business relations. They were, as Miss Eleanor Hallowell Abbott has said, "stupid in the affections." They felt the winds of affection blow and straightway they married. A little later they noticed that the winds of affection did not seem to blow, or at any rate that they did not realize them. They then secured a divorce. They felt something and they acted, and they felt something else and they acted again. Their attitude in business was quite different. There are certain things that remain permanent through change. But no business man feels the same enthusiasm about his business all the time. He does not always long to go to his office at nine o'clock, but he goes. We do not always long to wash our faces when we get up, but we do it. We do not always long to eat our breakfast, but I hope we always do it. The winds of feeling come and go and are comparatively unimportant; they wax and wane, but in all affairs where we are not stupid we see that they are never safe guides, rather that will and loyalty are the guides, whether in hygiene, in business or in love.

I was traveling from Washington to Boston after a convention something like this, and

happened to be in the same Pullman smoking compartment with the best lawyer and doctor in Boston, both of them men who loved their work. They were talking of their return to their practice. "I hope you are coming back to your work full of enthusiasm," said the doctor to the lawyer. The lawyer looked away and shrugged his shoulders. "Because," said the doctor, "I am coming back to mine with loathing." Just then he loathed it heartily and yet he knew in his heart that he loved it. When we are expert in matters of business we know that feeling does not count as a guide, that by loyalty, will and determination we make a good thing of what we have begun. But when it comes to matters of affection we allow passivity to take the consecration and loyalty out of our love. We read the letter of the situation in our feelings. We ignore its spirit which lives in our will.

In loyalty we are always looking through the literal to the spirit. When you look at a person you look right through his eyes into his spirit; you do not look at his eyes or his nose or at any other feature, but through them to his personality. Chesterton has told us that if there is anything more ridiculous about a

human being than the fact that he has two legs, it is that now and then you catch him making an opening in his face and putting portions of the outer world into that opening. That is the literal aspect of the human being, yet every one of us is a past master of the art of looking through that to the spirit of the ordinary lovable person behind it.

7

I have spoken of the contagion of personality as the source of all noble love and all nobility, and I want to touch now very briefly on some methods that I personally have seen and used in trying to build up these safeguards of the right against the wrong type of affection.

In the first place I think we do not call out the latent powers of hero worship that there are in most boys and girls, as we might, through the use of biography. You cannot study biography with the malice aforethought of making people admire it; but study it as history, for history is nothing but a series of great personalities. Even the history of science is the history of a succession of great

personalities, like Pasteur and Ehrlich. We could teach all history in this way if we would. In school and out of school, in clubs and in our Associations, and by our conversation, we can share our enthusiasm for persons in history, in biography; we might share them a great deal more than we do. The actual heart love of people whom we have never seen, people in history, is just as real to boys and girls as to you and me—more real, very often, than the people before them. You know how many people feel a genuine warm affection for a character like Stevenson, whom they have never seen. They do not have to stretch the wings of idealism for that.

The study of good novels is also useful in this respect. Every good novel has much to teach as to the relations of human beings. This field has not been worked as it should be. I do not think that it should be neglected, especially in working with girls.

Common work and play that mingle young and old of both sexes are valuable. But here I want to dwell more upon the matter of play. I believe in dancing for young people as a typical form of play, which can do great good as well as great harm. I believe that many

churches and high-minded people have taken a wrong attitude about this because of recognition of dangers, and I pledge you there is no one who recognizes these dangers more than I do. But I feel sure that these dangers can be avoided, and I think we ought to encourage the meeting of young people and others in dances of the right spirit and under supervision which will not prevent the success and popularity of the dance, but will keep it within bounds. I think any kind of play is good for people. Often a body of earnest workers, such as you, do not play together as much as they ought. I belong to a club of social workers in Boston who, until last year, for fifteen years had never had a play night. Last year we had a drama night, and we are going to do it again this year, just as soon as I get home from this trip. Play is close to beauty and to art, and dancing is the very thing that makes the transition from play to art, for anyone can see without an opera glass that dancing is both play and art. To bring together and to keep together the nobility of art and the joyousness of play is one of the greatest tasks of our time.

If you want to ennoble people in their

human relations, give them something to do for some one else. I have seen a group of boy cigarette fiends much improved by being banded together in an anti-cigarette league which made them feel their responsibilities for other boys. Or when girls are banded together to look after other girls, as they have been by Miss Maude E. Miner in New York, it calls out the consecration of service. This is so familiar to you, however, that I will not dwell on it.

* * * * * * *

The thing that I have been trying most of all to say to you through these lectures is that vitality, life, is the greatest word in the Christian vocabulary, and that to consecrate and purify love we want life in its fullest, richest sense, the union of body and spirit, with neither ever left out, and that life is communicated, as every Christian knows, and is blessed in knowing, through the contagion of the greatest personalities and especially through the contagion of that personality Who came that we might have life and have it more abundantly.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON SOCIAL MORALITY FROM THE CHRISTIAN STANDPOINT

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON SOCIAL MORALITY FROM THE CHRISTIAN STANDPOINT

As Adopted by the Fourth Biennial Convention of the Young Women's Christian Associations of the United States, Richmond, Va., April 9-15, 1913.

I. Purpose

It is the purpose of this Commission to recommend that the resources of the Young Women's Christian Association as a national organization be enlisted in the present crusade for a widespread knowledge of the laws of health and chastity; and to offer and promote a constructive program based upon a sound and just standard.

II. Standard

1. The highest standard of conduct as related to the continuation of human life—for

centuries an ideal attained only by a few—is today so re-enforced by the facts of medical science that this generation has no choice as to its responsibility *to make the highest standard universal.*

2. We, as a body of Christian women, organized to further social, physical, intellectual, and spiritual development of normal womanhood, are under obligation *to promote knowledge* of the fundamental facts of life, *to arouse sympathetic attitude towards* them, and *to call forth the power* whereby this knowledge shall make for individual and community morality.

3. If we are to help bring in an era in which young people will be prepared to withstand the temptations that assail from within and without, we must premise that that end can only be achieved by a far finer means than mere courses of instruction in the physical laws of sex—in other words, that the formative power of spiritual forces must be fully enlisted. Effort must be directed toward establishing those positive moral qualities which render young people immune to the dangers clustering about sex, and toward bringing them to desire and accept the more abundant life, the heightened vitality, which

alone will enable them to live above such temptations. The Commission, in accordance with this standard, recommends the following program, in order to meet the specific needs of the women and girls of today.

III. Working Program

1. *Agency*

a. The local Young Women's Christian Association where it is organized, in cities, towns, counties or colleges.

b. The church, women's clubs, or other qualified organizations in communities where there is no Association, the approach to and co-operation with such coming from this Commission.

2. *Grouping.* The United States may be grouped by

a. Types of communities:

Colleges,
Cities or towns,
Cities or towns containing colleges, where work can be combined,
Counties or other open communities,
Industrial centers.

b. Types of people:

General groups:

Girls of from six to sixteen—as in grade and high schools, industrial clubs, in the Associations, etc.

Young women of from sixteen to twenty-five—as those of leisure, those in the Association physical education classes, industrial clubs, etc.

Women—as Association board and committee members, mothers' clubs, teachers, and groups of mothers who have lacked educational privileges.

Special groups:

Normal schools.

Girls in co-educational or women's colleges (strategic colleges from which future teachers and leaders will come, to be considered of first importance).

3. *Preliminary work in a given community*

Presentation of the subject by a representative of the Commission to community leaders and organizations, and, when wise, to mass meetings of women.

4. *Courses of study*

The following tentative outline of courses is suggested for a period of four years. Texts, supplementary reading and bibliographies will be published or selected and endorsed by the Commission.

PRELIMINARY COURSES

To be given in a series of several talks. Wherever possible, as in regular school courses, the biological approach should be made through courses covering at least one term's work.

General Groups

1. For girls from six to sixteen:

Argument. Education for the girl of from six to twelve should not develop consciousness, but should tend to create interest in the things about her and in nature's care to continue life. For the older girl these things must be related to her own development and experiences. The girl in her early teens knows these things only in parts. She is full of interest and curiosity,

and the way in which these are met or not met will form her ideals and her physical and moral habits. For her the biological method of instruction seems well adapted; it opens up nature's wonders, the simplicity of complex processes, and helps her to relate her knowledge to life as she acquires it. At this age the average girl is ready to dedicate her affections to the ideal. It will therefore be found opportune to introduce the discussion of concrete ethical and spiritual problems, thus preventing an undue emphasis upon the physical aspects of life which often leads to morbidness and revulsion of feeling.

The material to be presented should tend to develop a healthy sense of romance, by means of poetry (such as the story of the Holy Grail), pageantry, heraldry, Old World folk lore, hero tales; to modernize this sense of romance by study of national or community customs and local color, of the "knights and ladies of today"—their manners and customs; to spiritualize the laws of life, by means, for example, of the Christmas story; to lead to discussion of the fundamental laws of ethics—truthfulness, honor, faithfulness, right and wrong, helpfulness.

2. For young women of from sixteen to twenty-five:

Argument. The leisure girl is often unprepared for life's experiences because of the mistaken idea of her protectors that ignorance is innocence. Her thoughtlessness in her dress, conversation or behavior may drive the undisciplined young man to seek and deceive the unprotected girl. On the other hand, no girl is more "knowing" than the wage-earner, for the "older hands" initiate her early throught the unwholesome story or innuendo. She is forced to think of sex matters in relation to herself by the suggestion made to her of what she may expect from suitors or find in marriage. Her great need is *ideals.* Instruction in the laws of sex must be combined with character training. She must be taught all that is necessary for her own protection and must be put on her honor for other girls. Both she and the girl of the leisure classes must be taught greater reverence for self, the "big sister" attitude toward younger girls, belief in the single standard, and their need for help from a higher power in order to attain this ideal.

The material to be presented to this group

may be in the form of "practical talks," with open discussion of: the bodies we live in; the homes we live in; or the community we live in. A right sense of romance may be developed through the study of poetry, biography, novels, plays, music and art, all tending to make for a right choice of ideal. A course in equity might be planned in the form of debates leading to discussion of the double versus the single standard of morality.

(Both younger and older girls need to be carefully introduced into the realm of nature, patriotism and religion in order that their affections may be definitely directed toward ideals by which they are enriched and deepened and at the same time purified. Heart and mind must be pre-empted by the good and true as the best means of keeping out the impure and false.)

3. For women:

Argument. We must enlist motherhood, potential and actual, in the changing of the present moral attitude, leading to a uniform standard for men and women and to a right emphasis on chastity of life for the married as well as the unmarried. Women must be put

on their honor to feel not only their sacred responsibilty for childhood, but for youth as well, that every girl or boy whom they consciously or unconsciously influence may get from them the highest ideals of manhood and womanhood. The problems of married women are a separate group by themselves and lectures to this class should be given only by a married woman. Single women form another group. The dignity and worth of the unmarried as well as of the married life need to be upheld today.

The material for this group may be in the form of: a course on "the woman movement" leading to the right valuation of womanhood and the responsibility for every woman to promote it; talks and discussions on home life and parenthood; a course on "what, when and how to tell children the simple facts of physical life."

Special Groups

1. Normal schools:

Argument. The normal school student is the girl who is preparing to take upon herself the most responsible and difficult service per-

formed for humanity outside the home—the supervision and training of children *en masse*. She is usually a recent graduate of the high school. In the community to which she goes she will be an important member of society. In the country district her personal standards will influence the young people outside. the school, while to the children she will represent the ideal woman. To the first she must be sister and friend; to the latter, guide and counselor as well as teacher.

Her point of view on moral questions is of first importance. Her knowledge of biology, physiology and hygiene needs to be related to life from its social and racial aspects. She must have an open-minded, scientific and respectful attitude toward sex problems and must be prepared to set standards in manners and morals.

2. Girls in co-educational or women's colleges:

Argument. The college girl away from home, for perhaps the first time, is inclined to misuse her new liberty, either innocently or willfully because she is "where it won't matter." Another danger is her inability to think

for herself; her individual judgment is overruled by "mob mind." In the upperclassmen years of responsibility, if in a women's college, she generally becomes intensely interested in the fundamental problems of life and seldom leaves college without having acquired a more or less rational knowledge of the laws of sex. But because of her four years of comparative isolation her adjustment to life after graduation is often a series of shocks. In a co-educational college the problem is radically different. Here the college girl has a tremendous opportunity before graduation which she generally does not grasp. Often carried away by a false sense of democracy she will, for example, recognize college men socially whom she would not invite to her mother's home. Tacitly, and generally without knowing what it really means, she recognizes for many of the men with whom she associates a different moral standard from her own. She must be taught to use her finest sense of womanliness in all her college relationships, for in the close corporation of college life she can do more than any one factor to "level up" to the single standard.

In whatever form material is presented to

the college girl, it must so commend itself to the college authorities that it will hasten the day when instruction in social morality, over and above pure science, is an indispensable part of every curriculum. Where the Commission has the privilege of co-operating with the colleges, series of talks may be given to special groups, as in dormitories or clubs, such as can be followed by personal talks through the year by the lecturer, the college physician or physical director, the dean, a wise faculty woman, or the Association secretary, these to supplement the physiological knowledge and the general culture already provided for by the curriculum. Appeal may be made to the older girls for their responsibility for the younger based on whatever system of relationship, such as "sponsor" or "senior adviser," exists in the given college between upper and under classmen. Opportunity may be given for engaged girls to seek explanation of what marriage involves, which it is sometimes easier for them to seek while still in college than after returning home.

In the larger institutions, from which the future outstanding teachers and leaders of the community are to be drawn, part of the teach-

ing may of course be based on the same principles as those used for the normal schools.

Additional Courses

After the first year the plans may extend to:

Additional courses to provide for consecutive and extended work.

Specialized courses in units of not more than three months for groups reached the first year.

Increase of area covered to reach larger numbers.

Enlargement based on results of first and second year's work; perhaps increased attention to community standards, with possible test of convictions in some typical community.

It Is Recommended

That the Young Women's Christian Associations of the United States give their approval to the widespread promotion of social morality from the Christian standpoint;

That they endorse the above report;

That they empower this Commission to put the suggested program into operation.

VICTORIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY